

REMARKS

Application request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-9 and 23-28 are pending.

The Applicants appreciate the withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action, as set forth in the reset Office Action dated August 29, 2003.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove redundant language that inadvertently survived the amendments to claim 1 submitted on March 24, 2003.

On June 26, 2001, the Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS). However, the Examiner has not returned the Forms PTO-1449 with all references initialed. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner initial and return a copy of the attached Forms PTO-1449 to indicate that the documents have been considered.

Claims 1-3, 9, and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Strauss U.S. Patent No. 5,719,449 (Strauss). Claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss and further in view of Iwabuchi U.S. Patent No. 6,030,890 (Iwabuchi).

The Applicants submit that each of claims 1-9 and 23-28 patentably defines over Strauss, whether taken individually or in combination with Iwabuchi. Note that each of independent claims 1-2 and 25-28 is limited by the following feature: "said testing pad being not coupled to any protruding electrode (bump)." Further, each of the independent claims 23-24 is limited by the following feature: "said conductive layer (testing pad) is electrically isolated from any bump."

In rejecting the independent claims, the Examiner points to Strauss's teaching of "a plurality of first and second terminals 222, 224", "protruding electrodes 225 (solder bumps)", and "testing pads 222, 223 respectively connected to said second terminals, said testing pads being not coupled to any protruding electrode." Setting aside the apparent inconsistency of Strauss's reference numeral 222 representing both first terminals and testing pads, the Applicants note that testing pad 222 and solder bump pad 224 are electrically connected by metal layer 217. Further, Strauss shows solder bump 225 provided at the solder bump pad 224. Thus, Strauss apparently violates the limitation required by the claims in which the testing pads are not coupled (or are electrically isolated) from any protruding electrode or bump.

Furthermore, Strauss teaches away from this claimed requirement. Note column 2, lines 4-5 ("Metal conductors connect each solder bump pad to a corresponding wafer probe pad."); column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 1 ("It can be seen that in the illustrative embodiment, the test pad, solder bump pad, and the conductor that forms the connection therebetween are formed in the same metal layer."); column 3, lines 19-21 ("In addition to the solder pads, the present invention provides for test pads connected to the solder pads."); and column 3, lines 31-33 ("The conductors that connect the solder pads and the test pads are shown illustratively in the corners of the IC in FIG. 4.").

The secondary reference to Iwabuchi is applied as allegedly teaching the claimed insulating films that are respectively formed of different materials, with one insulating film being formed of a material higher in elastic modulus than another insulating film, and the claimed organic substance-containing film being a polyimide film. Iwabuchi is not alleged to show, and does not appear to show, the claimed non-coupling of testing pads and protruding electrodes or bumps. Accordingly, the combination of Strauss and Iwabuchi fails to render obvious the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 684-1120
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157
Date: December 29, 2003